



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Dr. Briggs excels as an analyst, but he is lacking in discrimination and balance. The result is a voluminous treatise poorly put together, and, as its outcome, a "Bible" which the ultra-Protestant world, out of which the gifted author has recently stepped, can no longer regard as an object of worship, and in which its children will have to part with "the sweet stories told them in early life," because they are only "products of the imagination, and we dare not build on them as historic verities."

But in the general unsettlement the Catholic Churchman will feel more than ever thankful that behind the Book so analyzed and mutilated and disparaged there is the Church, "the Church, of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth"—the Church whose privilege and glory it is to "define and guard, and to define in order to guard," the sacred and divine deposit of the Christian "faith once and for all delivered to the saints."

R. H. S.

AN IMPORTANT EDUCATIONAL DOCUMENT.

THE STUDY OF HISTORY IN SCHOOLS. Report to the American Historical Association by the Committee of Seven: A. C. McLaughlin, Chairman; Herbert B. Adams, Geo. L. Fox, A. B. Hart, Chas. H. Haskins, Lucy M. Salmon, H. Morse Stephens. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1899.

The committee whose work is embodied in the above report was appointed in the early winter of 1896 by the American Historical Association, to consider the subject of history in secondary schools and to draw up a scheme of college entrance examinations in history. By means of circulars sent to typical schools in all parts of the Union, and by personal discussion with whatever secondary schoolmen they could come into contact with, the committee tried to get at the general sentiment on the subject and to present it in a crystallized form.

Within the last ten years the number of students studying history (other than United States history) has increased 152 per cent—a rate of increase lower than that of only one other study; evidently there is some need of a plan for entrance examinations which will give some credit to students having

done this history work. The report begins with a word for history itself, as worthy of consideration for other purposes than that of "cultivating patriotism;" then outlines a four years' course; speaks of the methods of instruction and the great need of trained teachers; and finally suggests a system of entrance requirements which, for their moderation and reasonableness, demand serious thought.

They propose, as most desirable, that there shall be in all secondary schools a four years' course in history, as follows:

I. Ancient, with special attention to Greece and Rome, including the early Middle Ages down to about 800 A.D.

II. Mediæval and modern history, 800 A.D. to present time.

III. English history.

IV. American history and civil government.

To prepare for such work as this in the secondary schools there must be in the primary schools some such system as Miss Salmon works out as the result of her own experience and more immediately of her study of the methods of teaching history in use in the German schools. Beginning in Grade III., when the pupil is about nine or ten, there should be stories from the "Iliad," those about King Arthur, etc.; Grade IV., interesting biographies of characters prominent in history; Grade V., Greek and Roman history to 800 A.D. *circa*; Grade VI., mediæval and modern European history from close of the first period to the present time; Grade VII., English history; Grade VIII., American history. The basis of this outline is a study of actual work in French and German schools.

As a whole, the committee makes the following recommendations as to entrance requirements, using the "unit" of one year of five periods each week, or two years of three periods:

1. Where there is complete option in the subjects to be presented for entrance (as at Leland Stanford), that 1, 2, 3, or 4 units of history be accepted as equivalent to 1, 2, 3, or 4 units of work in other subjects.

2. Where the college prescribes some subjects, and gives

choice as to others (as at Harvard), that at least one unit be prescribed, and 1, 2, or 3 units be placed on the optional list.

3. Where there is a rigid system, as at Yale, that at least one unit be prescribed.

Such moderate demands as these, following close upon the expression of the committee's deep feeling as to the absolute need of a four years' course, form but one of the indications that this report is drawn up by teachers whose zeal for their specialty is balanced by a wisdom which recognizes the state of affairs in our American schools to-day, and by the calm faith that, though it cannot do all at once, their word is to count.

It seems clear that the old rote system of teaching history, by which in June the pupil knew a vast number of dates and battles, and after a month's vacation had happily forgot them all, is passing. History, it cannot be said too often, is a humanity next to literature; yet a right study of history is entirely scientific in its methods; and the very nature of the subject itself makes against the formalism that may come from science or from too close study of grammar. For history teaching to be valuable the aim must be right—namely, to show the pupil that our world is one continuously changing organism in which the powers of right and wrong have been struggling through the ages, to cultivate his judgment, to give him breadth of view and sympathy, and above all, an imagination which will be proof against littleness in his outlook on the world. “No conscious advance, no worthy reform, can be secured without a knowledge of the present and an appreciation of how forces have worked in the political and social organization of former times.” More than fine gold is this important to schools trying to fit for citizenship, for to use, as the report does, Thomas Arnold's noble words: “It is clear that in whatever it is our duty to act it is also our duty to study.”

With this realization of the meaning and purpose of history there comes inevitably an appreciation of its unity and continuity, a point which the committee stresses carefully. It seems illogical, if there are no extraordinary reasons for

something else, to study from modern to ancient, because it is essential to an understanding of history to note development, to trace effects from causes, and this is almost dependent on chronology. It seems wise, too, if a school cannot give the full four years, that it condense one or two units instead of omitting; this condensation being produced by using English history and its European relations to eliminate the second year, or by studying France as a center for European history, leaving England to be studied as the preliminary and adjunct to the United States.

Besides the ignorance of the aim of history teaching, and the lack of continuity in the courses given, the report mentions the failure of teachers to appreciate the pedagogical value of history. To be sure, there is the practical value of the knowledge gained, and there is some development if only facts and dates are learned; but in history there is a chance to begin the development of every quality that goes to make up true culture, which is, we take it, the creation of character.

Of course history, as outlined here, cannot be taught by one trained only for another specialty, neither can it be taught by one trained for no specialty; it can be done only by those who have studied history in a thorough way besides having had the regular academic course—men who add to this a knowledge of the methods of the best teachers for infusing life and reality into the past. But even trained teachers cannot teach history thoroughly without the aid of apparatus, and of this apparatus of course the first piece to be secured is a good collection of historical works on the periods covered. When only one small book is used, it takes a man of exceptional ability to show a class that history is not a manufactured thing, that it grew and is growing, and that what he reads in a book is but the statement of facts with the interpretation of human reason thereon. If, however, it is possible to refer the student to several accounts of the same thing, not only will he come to a knowledge of what history is, but he will gain the precious power of handling books, of reading well. To this use of books a well-directed school will

add maps, pictures, relics, and various other devices to make the facts real. The utter absurdity of a teacher, not specially trained, using one small book, no wall maps, no collateral reading, no geography, and trying to teach history, must be self-evident. But if a teacher with an appreciation of history, a few books, a cheap map, and plenty of enthusiasm takes up the subject, the power he will exert for good is not easily to be measured. This is the point that should especially be noted by teachers in the South and West, where the use of great libraries has not had its influence toward making collections of books social necessities. If there is one thing that makes a man's education remain in touch with his business and bosom, it is a habit once formed of reading books intelligently; this habit can be created in the newer sections of the country, where reading is not widely done, only through the agencies of schools and colleges, and schools have the better chance of the two because they direct boys between fourteen and eighteen, the most formative period of life.

Among other things, the report contains a not quite convincing depreciation of the study of "general history;" an approval of the use of "sources," provided a text-book is also used and the sources consist of more than a few detached printed documents; geography is rightly declared absolutely necessary to any good work; careful study of a short period during the last year is rather vaguely commended; and the use of note-books, essays, and recitations is thought much better than mere questions and answers. A final important point is that history is to be studied in correlation with the other school work, that "the march of the Ten Thousand . . . be looked upon not merely as a procession of optative moods and conditional clauses, but as an account of the great victory won by Greek skill, discipline, and intelligence over the helplessness of Oriental confusion."

All of this is interesting; but the appendix, containing papers on the study of history in American primary schools, the German gymnasia, the French lycées, and the English grammar schools, comes near to equaling even the report. Yet this portion of the book seems destined to be neglected,

if one may judge from some published expressions of opinion on the report. These think the committee desire too much, that they are in fact history specialists with an ax to grind, and no real appreciation of the condition of affairs in our secondary schools, the amount of work already required there, and the impossibility of increasing this. This view is to be explained only on the supposition that the man who holds it has not read Miss Salmon's paper on German schools; for in these schools history is studied from nine to eighteen, is studied in chronological order, and is studied thoroughly; yet it remains to be shown that the Germans neglect other essential branches. The prompt rejection of the committee's suggestions as entirely impracticable is due simply to a combination of the shallow American optimism which storms out that in everything we follow the best possible method, with a surly English self-esteem which is unwilling to take as good anything that comes from abroad. As a consequence of this combination, English and American schools are those where history is worst taught, while the French and German schools, which surely do as much as we in other respects, far surpass us in this. The American youth of twenty-one frequently takes in his Junior year at college a course in United States history, because, he good-naturedly explains, "Of course you must know *something* of your country;" but the French or German youth of the same age, if he is in the university, is capable of doing work such as we expect only of graduates; or if he is at work in the world, has a knowledge of how things came to be as they are, a breadth of human interest, a power of judgment and balance that we cannot ask of our jingo Congressmen; and yet these boys are trained as "subjects," and we are to train ours as "citizens."

As a writer in *The Nation* says, the report shows the great need now of a consideration of college requirements as a whole, embracing the demands of all branches. If some system could be brought into the work of our secondary schools, we should be less crowded, less hurried, and yet we should do more work that is worth doing. This, how-

ever, does not seem the chief demand of the book; this demand is that we awake to the fact that we Americans, who need most an understanding of history, have the least, and that, like the heathen in his blindness, we are still not conscious of our condition. GEORGE CLIFTON EDWARDS.

GREAT NAVAL CONTESTS.

TWENTY FAMOUS NAVAL BATTLES—SALAMIS TO SANTIAGO. By Edward Kirk Rawson, Professor U. S. Navy, Superintendent Naval War Records. Boston and New York: T. Y. Crowell & Co. 1899. 8vo, 2 vols. pp. xxx, 344; vi, 385.

It would be hard to name any recent book better fitted for gift purposes, whether at the holiday season or at any other time, than the popular and attractive work the title of which is given above. Indeed, the sumptuous appearance of these volumes ought to delight any book lover, and certainly these are days when nearly every Anglo-Saxon, save a few grumbling reactionaries, is interested in tracing the history of the exploits of his race upon the sea. In his justifiable endeavor to furnish Creasy's famous book with a companion Prof. Rawson has chosen battles the importance of which no one can contest. If it is rather early to be writing calmly about the battles of Manila Bay and Santiago, still no one can doubt that they are likely to be included in any list of twenty battles made in the near future by a competent hand. Manila Bay will doubtless lose some of its luster—one-sided battles always do—and Dewey's success may some day be set down to talent rather than to genius comparable to Nelson's, but of one thing we may be certain—the battle, like that of Santiago, was unique, although Prof. Rawson does show that in many respects it suggests the battle of Gibraltar, in 1607, when the Dutch, under Van Heemskerck, destroyed the Spanish squadron.

There seems to be little criticism in Prof. Rawson's later chapters, and this is doubtless well, for until the rancorous friends of Admirals Schley and Sampson subside, and the Dewey enthusiasts take their well-earned repose, criticism stands no chance of being heard, and may be unnecessarily